

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
ROBERT G. DREITLEIN,

Plaintiff,

- against -

VELDOS, LLC,

Defendant.  
-----X

MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER

14-CV-4158 (ARR) (JO)

JAMES ORENSTEIN, Magistrate Judge:

Attorney Craig Thor Kimmel ("Kimmel") is admitted to practice in the states of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and New York; he is not admitted to practice before this court. Kimmel has applied to be admitted *pro hac vice* on behalf of the plaintiff in the instant case pursuant to Local Civil Rule 1.3(c). Docket Entry ("DE") 4. For the reasons set forth below, I deny the motion without prejudice to renewal upon a showing that such admission is appropriate under the circumstances of this case.

Kimmel is a member of the law firm Kimmel & Silverman, P.C., located in New York City. I take notice of the fact that the firm is associated with the website [www.creditlaw.com](http://www.creditlaw.com), which indicates that the firm handles debt collection matters in ten states, including New York. *See* "Fair Debt Collection: The Credit Law Attorneys," <http://www.creditlaw.com/about-us.htm> (last visited on July 22, 2014). As set forth in the margin, Kimmel has sought or obtained admission *pro hac vice* in 19 cases in this court since 2012.<sup>1</sup> It thus appears that he regularly engages in the practice of law in this district.

---

<sup>1</sup> *See Hills v. Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC*, 12-cv-00742 (BMC), Order dated Mar. 9, 2012; *Depoala v. Professional Recovery Consultants, Inc.*, 12-cv-02230 (SJF) (GRB), Order dated May 9, 2012; *Rodney v. United Recovery Systems, Inc.*, 12-cv-05097 (SLT) (RER), Order dated Oct. 15, 2012; *Chudomel v. Dynamic Recovery Services, Inc.*, 12-cv-05365 (NGG) (RLM), DE 5; *Arroyo v. Frontline Asset Strategies, LLC*, 13-cv-00195 (BMC), DE 2; *Jenkins-Miles v. GC Services, LP*, 13-cv-01533 (CBA) (RER), Order dated Apr. 2, 2013; *Rodney v. Primary Financial Services, LLC*, 13-cv-02714 (ARR) (SMG), Order dated May 10, 2013; *Morgan v. Law Firm of Daniels, Norelli, Scully & Cecere, P.C.*, 13-cv-03250 (ERK) (JO), DE 17; *Chapman v. Midland Funding, LLC et al*, 13-cv-03695 (DLI) (VVP), Order dated Dec. 9, 2013; *Chapman v. Receivable Management Services*, 13-cv-03782 (JG) (CLP), DE 10; *Donovan v. Allied Interstate, LLC*, 13-cv-04521 (DLI) (RLM), DE 6; *Chery v. Recovery Management Services, Inc.*, 13-cv-05734 (SLT) (RLM), DE 5; *Davis v. Asset Acceptance Capital Corp.*, 13-cv-05735 (PKC) (JMA), Order dated Oct. 22, 2013; *Tulloch v. Frontline*

Yet by routinely gaining admission *pro hac vice* rather than taking the steps necessary to join the bar of this court, he remains immune to much of the disciplinary oversight to which his colleagues are subjected. *See* Loc. Civ. R. 1.5(b)-(c).

This court routinely grants attorneys who practice elsewhere the courtesy of representing clients who find themselves involved in litigation in this court. But "[a]dmission *pro hac vice* is by definition, at most, admission for a single proceeding." *In re Rappaport*, 558 F.2d 87, 88 n.1 (2d Cir. 1977). It is a privilege rather than a right, *see Leis v. Flynt*, 439 U.S. 438, 441-42 (1979), and one that should not be abused. If Kimmel intends to continue representing clients in this court, he can and should secure the admission to our bar. If, on the other hand, he can somehow demonstrate that his spate of applications for admission *pro hac vice* in recent years represents an aberration from his normal practice, and that he does not anticipate making future similar applications on a routine basis, then I will of course grant him the same courtesy that is routinely afforded to out-of-state counsel in their occasional visits to this district.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York  
July 22, 2014

/s/  
JAMES ORENSTEIN  
U.S. Magistrate Judge

---

*Asset Strategies, LLC*, 13-cv-07025 (JG) (RLM), DE 6; *Bonilla et al v. Rubin & Rothman, LLC*, 14-cv-04021 (RJD) (VVP), Order dated July 1, 2014; *Abraham v. Vantage Sourcing, LLC*, 14-cv-04027 (RJD) (JMA), Order dated June 30, 2014; *Catampatan v. Client Services, Inc.*, 14-cv-04029 (ARR) (SMG), Order dated July 1, 2014; *Rodney et al v. CBE Group, Inc.*, 14-cv-04162 (MKB) (RML), DE 4 (motion pending); *Goode v. Vision Financial Corp.*, 14-cv-04272 (SJ) (RER), Order dated July 16, 2014.